


TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman 

SUBJECT: Receive the Report on the 2006-07 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) has, since 2000, initiated several changes in the procedures for reviewing and approving teacher preparation programs in order to assure that the state's programs continue to advance in quality.

During the same period, Title II, Section 208(a) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) has required that each state establish criteria, identify, and assist teacher preparation institutions that are not performing at a satisfactory level. In order to receive funds under the HEA, states are required to have a procedure to identify and assist low-performing programs of teacher preparation within institutions of higher education. States must also provide to the United States Department of Education (USED) a statement of its procedure along with annual lists of low-performing and at-risk teacher preparation institutions.

The Office of Professional Preparation Services (OPPS) developed, and the State Board of Education (SBE) approved with amendments, a set of criteria that reflect the overall effectiveness of the preparation program, using multiple factors. Criteria include weighted components from the 2000-06 reviews of institutional programs, the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) test scores, new teacher efficacy surveys, supervisor validation of new teachers' efficacy, program completion rates, and additional consideration for the program's mission that is responsive to the state's teacher preparation needs. Attachment A shows the performance score for each approved teacher preparation institution in the state, not including new institutions yet to receive probationary SBE approval.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

808 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

Attachment B is the formula used for identifying performance, as amended and approved by the SBE at its October 9, 2007 meeting. The SBE approved increasing the threshold for responsiveness to state needs from the previous 10% to 35% for the 2008-09 report (section 5 of attachment B).

The MDE will report the institutions identified as at-risk or low-performing to the USED per HEA requirements. This report will also be shared with the SBE appointed Professional Standards Commission for Teachers (PSCT) so that its members can assist in the continued development of a technical assistance plan for improving at-risk and low-performing teacher preparation programs. Institutions identified as low-performing have two years to improve their performance before state sanctions occur. Sanctions for these institutions will be determined by June 2009. Institutions identified as at-risk must progress to the satisfactory category within two years or move to the low-performing category, even if their raw score is still in the at-risk level.

Teacher preparation institutions may appeal preliminary performance scores to the PSCT. The PSCT received appeals for the 2006-07 scores from Albion College, and Olivet College. The PSCT voted to deny both appeals, based on a lack of supportive documentation.

Based on the most recent reports over two years:

- Marygrove remains in the low-performing category for a second year.
- Adrian moved from low-performing to satisfactory.
- Olivet moved from satisfactory to at-risk.
- University of Detroit Mercy moved from satisfactory to low-performing.

Aggregate data at the level of the institution will be reported on the MDE website along with the currently public MTTC scores.

For the 2008-09 academic year teacher preparation institutions are expected to submit to the OPPS evidence of seeking and using feedback from principals regarding new teachers' preparation. No points will be associated with this data for the pilot year.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education receive the report on the 2006-07 Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated July 28, 2008.

MDE Teacher Preparation Performance Scores
for Academic Year 2006-07

Institution / Status	Overall Score	MTTC 30	Teacher Exit Surveys 5				Supervisor Surveys 5				Program Completion Rate 10 (Cohort)		Program Review Status 10		Diversity 5		High Need Content* 5	
			Resp		Eff		Resp		Eff									
			%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points	%	Points
			EXEMPLARY															
Andrews	70	91	30	91	100	5	98	100	5	92	10	100	10	45	5	39	5	
Grand Valley	68	96	30	92	96	5	90	97	5	92	10	100	10	6	3	26	5	
UM-Ann Arbor	68	98	30	84	100	5	92	100	5	88	8	100	10	11	5	28	5	
Wayne State	68	90	30	95	100	5	96	93	5	85	8	100	10	26	5	45	5	
Madonna	66	92	30	91	100	5	94	100	5	85	8	100	10	5	3	55	5	
MSU	66	98	30	89	100	5	90	100	5	86	8	100	10	7	3	38	5	
Saginaw Valley	66	92	30	93	99	5	91	91	5	88	8	100	10	6	3	69	5	
Calvin	65	98	30	93	100	5	97	85	5	92	10	100	10	2	0	52	5	
Hillsdale	65	91	30	86	100	5	100	85	5	100	10	100	10	0	0	55	5	
Hope	65	97	30	93	100	5	97	97	5	93	10	100	10	2	0	53	5	
Oakland	65	94	30	92	100	5	96	100	5	90	10	100	10	4	0	39	5	
Eastern	64	94	30	83	98	5	90	70	3	75	6	100	10	14	5	59	5	
Alma	63	92	30	91	100	5	96	92	5	80	8	100	10	3	0	41	5	
Central	63	94	30	86	95	5	94	82	5	85	8	100	10	3	0	54	5	
MI Tech	63	95	30	88	100	5	82	100	5	89	8	100	10	0	0	100	5	
Northern	63	95	30	91	88	5	95	65	3	96	10	100	10	3	0	53	5	
Spring Arbor	63	92	30	92	95	5	94	86	5	81	8	100	10	4	0	31	5	
SATISFACTORY																		
Ferris	61	91	30	90	94	5	92	33	0	85	8	94	8	45	5	22	5	
UM-Dearborn	61	89	25	91	100	5	97	100	5	73	6	100	10	25	5	91	5	
Concordia	60	93	30	88	96	5	90	58	0	98	10	100	10	4	0	29	5	
Aquinas	59	95	30	91	96	5	95	68	3	82	8	93	8	4	0	31	5	
Cornerstone	59	92	30	86	100	5	96	60	3	89	8	94	8	0	0	27	5	
Siena Hgts	59	88	25	96	98	5	98	78	3	86	8	100	10	5	3	16	5	
Adrian	58	84	20	94	100	5	87	71	3	94	10	100	10	13	5	37	5	
Albion	58	93	30	91	91	5	89	26	0	84	8	100	10	3	0	27	5	
UM-Flint	58	88	25	85	100	5	91	23	0	91	10	95	10	6	3	57	5	
LSSU	57	86	25	92	96	5	99	88	5	67	4	100	10	8	3	45	5	
Western	56	90	30	86	51	0	94	100	5	79	6	100	10	4	0	34	5	
Rochester	**	97	30	90	100	5	96	100	5	**	**	100	10	0	0	33	5	
AT-RISK																		
Olivet	54	88	25	90	86	5	90	50	0	72	6	100	10	5	3	33	5	
LOW-PERFORMING																		
Marygrove	36	71	0	93	100	5	91	99	5	79	6	100	10	59	5	41	5	
UDMercy	32	77	0	90	96	5	99	76	3	68	4	100	10	58	5	54	5	
* It was decided at the Oct. 07 State Board meeting, that the requirement of 35% high need would not take place until the 2007-08 academic year report.																		
** As a newly approved institution, there is not yet a six-year cohort to measure; status based on consideration of available data.																		

* It was decided at the Oct. 07 State Board meeting, that the requirement of 35% high need would not take place until the 2007-08 academic year report.

** As a newly approved institution, there is not yet a six-year cohort to measure; status based on consideration of available data.

Teacher Preparation Institution Performance Scores for Meeting Higher Education Act Title II Classification Requirement

The Michigan Department of Education (MDE) complies with the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title II state requirements and the State Board of Education (SBE) expectations by identifying four (4) Title II categories of teacher preparation institutions:

- Exemplary Performance Teacher Preparation
- Satisfactory Performance Teacher Preparation
- At-Risk Teacher Preparation
- Low-Performing Teacher Preparation

The following six criteria will be used for placement of a teacher preparation institution into a Title II performance category as identified above.

PERFORMANCE SCORE RUBRIC: Total points possible: 70

1. Test pass rate (30 points):

Test pass rate shall be the three-year aggregate of all specialty content areas for individuals validated by the institution as ready for the content test (note: not necessarily program completers). The MDE creates a summary score for the institution based upon its aggregate pass rate information on validated (subject to state audit) candidates.

The MDE identifies four test pass rate categories to be used to allocate points (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

- a. 90% or higher = 30 points
- b. 85 - 89% = 25 points
- c. 80 - 84% = 20 points
- d. Below 80% = 0 points

2. Program Review *(10 points):

As part of periodic review or an equivalent accreditation process, a determination is made as to the status of each endorsement program. Full approval = 1, approval suspended by the state (or equivalent accrediting body) = 0**. These scores are totaled and divided by the total number of programs so classified, to determine the percent of programs approved (this is done to avoid penalizing institutions of any particular size or number of programs). The possible range of scores is thus 0 through 100%. The points are awarded as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

95% or more programs approved = 10 points
 90 - 94% programs approved = 8
 85 - 89% programs approved = 6
 80 - 84% programs approved = 4
 75 - 79% programs approved = 3

*Periodic review priorities as determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction will be added to this criteria.

**Note: A program withdrawn by the institution is not included in the calculation of the percent approved.

3. Program Completion (10 points):

The number of candidates who are recommended (or who are eligible for recommendation) by the institution for a teaching certificate within six years of entering a cohort, divided by the total number of candidates admitted into the teacher preparation cohort at or beyond the junior year of a baccalaureate program or at entrance into a post baccalaureate program during a specified academic year. In each case, a cohort will be defined by the number who entered the program (e.g., using 2003-2004 academic year data as the denominator, the six-year completion rate would be calculated based on recommendations during 2008-2009 academic year).

This information is calculated by the institution and subject to state audit. The points are awarded as follows (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number)

90% = 10 points*
 80 - 89% = 8 points
 70 - 79% = 6 points
 60 - 69% = 4 points
 50 - 59% = 2 points

*Note: the maximum point category is set only at 90% to acknowledge that institutions have a responsibility to identify candidates whose commitment or classroom performance is not suitable for the profession, even if academic qualifications that led to program admission are strong. However, over time, it is expected that institutional admission criteria would increasingly reflect Institutional experiences of the qualifications, both academic and interpersonal, needed for success in the specific program.

4. Survey of candidates and supervisors (10 points):**A. Survey of candidates: (5 points)**

The score will depend on the aggregate results of the survey of candidates completing student teaching regarding their perceived readiness (efficacy) in each of the seven Entry-Level Standards for Michigan Teachers (ELSMT) areas. Since response rate is important to validity of results, the MDE expects institutions to assure that a large proportion of their student teachers complete the survey. The response rate is built into the points awarded in this area as indicated in the following table (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number):

Student Teachers Response rate:	80-100% Efficacy	70-79% Efficacy	60-69% Efficacy	Below 60% Efficacy
80-100%	5	4	3	0
60-79%	3	2	1	0
Below 60%	0	0	0	0

B. Survey of supervisors: (5 points)

Beginning in 2006-07, institutions are also required to have supervisors of student teachers complete a short survey on the same readiness areas for each student teacher supervised. Validation of the student teachers' perceived efficacy with the perceptions of supervisors makes a stronger case for the institution's impact on teacher readiness. The following table indicates the points awarded for different response rates and efficacy levels (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number).

Supervisors Response Rate:	80-100% Efficacy	70-79% Efficacy	60-69% Efficacy	Below 60% Efficacy
80-100%	5	4	3	0
60-79%	3	2	1	0
Below 60%	0	0	0	0

5. Institutional responsiveness to state need (10 points):

Some institutions have a mission responsive to state need as shown in their emphasis on providing access to diverse students and/or their emphasis on preparation of teachers in high need areas such as mathematics, science, special education, or other areas that the MDE may identify in its Title II HEA formula.

- A. Diversity score (5 points):** The 2004-2005 Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) indicates that less than 10% of Michigan's teaching force is represented by ethnic minorities. Ethnic minority categories are Black, Hispanic, Asian, Native American and Pacific Islander, and multi-racial, as used in other higher education national data.

1. Any teacher preparation institution recommending 10% or more minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) will receive 5 points.
2. Any teacher preparation institution recommending 5 to 9% minority candidates in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort of individuals) will receive 3 points.

B. Preparation of teachers in high need subject areas (5 points):

Any institution recommending 35% or more candidates with content specialty (major or minor-based endorsement) in special education, mathematics, science (i.e., endorsement codes DX, DI, at either elementary or secondary levels), or specific science endorsements (chemistry, physics, biology, earth/space science) at the secondary level, or world languages in the most recent academic year (irrespective of cohort) will receive 5 points. Other academic subject areas may be added to this list in the future by the MDE based on statewide teacher shortages. This change will be implemented during the 2008-09 reporting period.

6. Teaching success rate (points to be determined):

This longer term factor is expected to be identified during 2008. Teaching success rate is the number of new teachers from the institution evaluated as satisfactory or better; divided by the total number of all who were placed in Michigan in that focus year and for whom a rating was received, with a minimum of 85% for "Satisfactory" programs. This indicator will be implemented over time; as more systematic information becomes available on new teachers from the Center for Educational Performance and Information (CEPI) and from institutional follow up. The formula may change to reflect this new information.

Overall score: A range of 0 to 70 points is currently awarded. The total points will increase as other factors are implemented (decimals will be rounded to the nearest whole number)

63 (90%) or higher = exemplary
56 to 62 (80% to 89%) = satisfactory
52 to 55 (75% to 79%) = at-risk status
Below 52 = low performing

Institutions identified as low performing will have two years with an opportunity for technical assistance from the state to improve before penalties are imposed. Institutions that remain in the at-risk category for two consecutive years will be moved into the low performing category.

Appeals regarding an institution's performance status will be handled through the OPPS. The proposed Michigan Teacher Preparation Research Collaborative will be requested to review this document to determine if further revisions are needed.